

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ESAU REDIX,	)	No.: 1:20-cv-01647-NONE-SAB (PC)
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<u>ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND</u>
v.	)	<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
	)	
J. NAVARRO, et al.,	)	(Doc. No. 11)
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

Plaintiff Esau Redix is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On February 4, 2021, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that this action proceed against Defendants Navarro, Vera, Medina, Allison, and Higuera for excessive force, against Defendant Vera for sexual assault, against Defendants Navarro and Allison for death threats, and against Defendants Navarro, Gonzales, and Campos for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's medical needs. (Doc. No. 11.) The magistrate judge also recommended that all other claims be dismissed from the action for failure to state a cognizable claim for relief. (*Id.*)

////

////

1 The findings and recommendations were served on plaintiff and contained notice that objections were  
2 due within fourteen (14) days. (*Id.* at 2.) No objections were filed and the time to do so has expired.<sup>1</sup>

3 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a *de*  
4 *novo* review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court concludes that the  
5 magistrate judge's findings and recommendations are supported by the record and by proper analysis.

6 Accordingly,

- 7 1. The findings and recommendations issued on February 4, 2021 (Doc. No. 11), are  
8 adopted in full;
- 9 2. This action shall proceed against Defendants Navarro, Vera, Medina, Allison, and  
10 Higuera for excessive force, against Defendant Vera for sexual assault, against  
11 Defendants Navarro and Allison for death threats, and against Defendants Navarro,  
12 Gonzales, and Campos for deliberate indifference to Plaintiff's medical needs; and
- 13 3. All other claims are dismissed from the action.

14  
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: March 7, 2021

17   
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 <sup>1</sup> In response to the magistrate judge's screening order (Doc. No. 8), plaintiff filed a notice indicating  
that he wished to proceed on those claims found cognizable. (Doc. No. 9.)